Presume neg. First, to stand resolved is to be strongly in affirmation. Any plausible reason to reasonably deny the affirmative claim (i.e. terminal defense) is sufficient to pull the trigger on presumption. Also, text precludes any theoretical concerns because it’s the source of all pre-round preparation and arguments. By ignoring what is textual, we could never debate in the first place because we wouldn’t know what arguments we were entitled to, which is why it supersedes claims to fairness. Second, the aff gets to speak first and last. They get to set up and end the debate with their own comparison. Persuasive appeal outweighs time skew because the amount of arguments I make don’t matter if new cross apps in the 2AR preclude and are the last thing in a judge’s mind. Moreover, it’s harder to negate because debaters that pull tricks intentionally confuse the NC by being vague about the functions of arguments in CX and in the AC. This outweighs time skew because it doesn’t matter how much time I have to make arguments if the AC can circumvent that by making new clarifications and implications. And Time skew doesn’t matter, we both have 13 minutes of speech time meaning that it is equal for both sides. And, skepticism negates since we can’t incur desirability or obligations in a world where there’s no measurement of those ideas.

I value **Morality.** Epistemology precludes other issues ethics because we must understand how we come to know before we can question what should we know. All that I know is limited to that which I experience since coherent thought is based upon past occurrences. **Hume[[1]](#footnote-1):**

But although our**thought**seems to be so free, when we look more carefully we’ll find that it **is really confined within** very narrow limits, and that all this creative power of the mind amounts merely to the ability to combine, transpose, enlarge, or shrink the materials that the senses and**experience** provide us with. When we think of a golden mountain, we only join two consistent ideas—gold and mountain—with which we were already familiar. We can conceive a virtuous horse because our own feelings enable us to conceive virtue, and we can join this with the shape of a horse, which is an animal we know. In short, all the materials of thinking are derived either from our outward senses or from our inward feelings: all that the mind and will do is to mix and combine these materials. Put in philosophical terminology:**all our ideas** or more feeble perceptions**are copies of our impressions** or more lively ones. Here are two arguments that I hope will suffice to prove this. **(1) When we analyse our thoughts or ideas**—however complex or elevated they are—**we always find them to be made up of simple ideas that were copied from earlier feelings or sensations.** Even ideas that at first glance seem to be the furthest removed from that origin are found on closer examination to be derived from it. The idea of God—meaning an infinitely intelligent, wise, and good Being—comes from extending beyond all limits the qualities of goodness and wisdom that we find in our own minds. However far we push this enquiry, we shall find that every idea that we examine is copied from a similar impression. Those who maintain that this isn’t universally true and that there are exceptions to it have only one way of refuting it—but it should be easy for them, if they are right. They need merely to produce an idea that they think isn’t derived from this source. It will then be up to me, if I am to maintain my doctrine, to point to the impression or lively perception that corresponds to the idea they have produced.**(2) If a man can’t have some kind of sensation** because there is something wrong with his eyes, ears etc., **he will never be found to have corresponding ideas. A blind man can’t form a notion of colours, or a deaf man a notion of sounds**. If either is cured of his deafness or blindness, so that the sensations can get through to him, the ideas can then get through as well; and then he will find it easy to conceive these objects. The same is true for someone who has never experienced an object that will give a certain kind of sensation: a Laplander or Negro has no notion of the taste of wine ·because he has never had the sensation of tasting wine·. Similarly with inward feelings. It seldom if ever happens that a person has never felt or is wholly incapable of some human feeling or emotion, but the phenomenon I am describing does occur with feelings as well, though in lesser degree. A gentle person can’t form any idea of determined revenge or cruelty; nor can a selfish one easily conceive the heights of friendship and generosity. Everyone agrees that non-human beings may have many senses of which we can have no conception, because the ideas of them have never been introduced to us in the only way in which an idea can get into the mind, namely through actual feeling and sensation.

And, even if there was an objective notion of truth, it would still be harmed by individual subjectivity. For instance, when we see that we should be utilitarian, it is still up to the individual to see if they are consistent with utilitarianism.

Accepting authentic moral deliberation is required for personal epistemological fulfillment. Given that I only know that which I experience, the only thing I can base my moral evaluations on is my own conception of the world and others, requiring the government to allow possibilities for individual development. **Webster[[2]](#footnote-2):**

While one is never completely able to authenticate or even to recognise *all* the meanings one has gained from being culturally embedded, the authentic use of **one's existential freedom enables one to recognise** and make **possibilities for oneself**. The exercising of one's agency is understood to be contingent and is not absolute. Cultural and **institutional frameworks which offer universal meanings,** **should be engaged with by the individual** whoauthentically is able **to contextualise them with regards** to his or **her own experiences.** **Possibilities can be produced through such encounters which are then understood to be personally owned.** Consequentlyas one chooses one's possibilities with regards to how one gives meaning and purpose to all of one's activities, **one accepts ownership** and therefore responsibility **for committing one's existence and** therefore **all of one's decisions to the understanding that one has.** Through this authenticating of the individual**, a passionate commitment that gives meaning** and purpose **to the way that one exists can be developed.**

Thus, the standard is **respecting agency,** defined as allowing for individual values to align with moral decisions. And, this precedes the AC, since in order to achieve moral value at all, we must align are choices with that moral value, meaning my case is the only one that bridges the ought-ought gap.

I contend that affirming constitutes a violation of individual’s existential choice.

One, rehab coerces individuals to take medicine and do whatever procedure necessary to become healthy again, takes the individuals choice away about what they should do with their body. They also force people to stay in custody for a certain amount of time, which prevents individuals from choosing to leave.

Two, reject the affirmative advocacy because the affirmative presents a criterion for ethical conduct, implying that the morality of an act ought be deduced by each actor with reference to a static conception of the good that pre-exists the actor, excluding her from the process of creating values systems as the proclaimed “truth” about morality is said to already be known.

Third, rehab tries to change people **Hillman 11**[[3]](#footnote-3)

The second point where the **rehab**ilitation programs **fail[s]** is **[since] the prisoner has to want to change his** or her **life around and many have not come to that point** yet**.** Additionally, **many states offer time cuts for taking** these **rehab**ilitation **programs and** many **prisoners take these programs just to get the time cuts.** I have **many a prisoner come up to me and say, "Yeah, I am going to go back** out **on the streets slinging drugs because that is the best way I can make money."** Which did not make any sense to me because now most prisons do have vocational schools or college courses available; however, depending on a person's offense, it does not matter the education level, sometimes it is very hard to get a decent paying job once released from prison. Maybe a good solution for this problem is for a first time drug offender or a person who seems to suffer from a mental illness, put them in a rehabilitation center instead of a jail or prison. Prison only makes people angrier and teaches them how to be better criminals. I have seen people go into prison for white collar crimes and come out drug addicts and better criminals. The prison system is something that definitely needs to be re-worked and re-adjusted because it is definitely failing.

And, this is a turn to the aff because you can’t decrease crime if people truly are criminals and they can’t be changed.

Fourth, the best way to allow one to confront the meaning to life is to put them in prison or on death row, since there is nothing for one to do. In Albert Camus’s *The Stranger,* the main character finds the meaning to life after months in prison.
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